

Q.
303.48243
am 228

File Copy

President Eisenhower's Mutual Aerial
Inspection Plan as Seen by the
West German Public

Report No. 228
Series No. 2
March 6, 1956

RESEARCH STAFF

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

AMERICAN EMBASSY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
INTRODUCTION	i
SUMMARY	ii
I. Knowledge	1 - 5
II. General Attitudes and Expectations	6 - 16
III. Implementation	17 - 41
APPENDIX	42 - 49

INTRODUCTION

The present report is the latest in a regular series of program guidance studies of West German reactions to major political developments and issues. It is concerned with the aerial inspection plan proposed by President Eisenhower at the Summit Conference of the Four Powers in Geneva during July 1955, and is intended to provide some guidance for the USIS project 'Mutual Inspection for Peace'. The purpose of the project is a) to acquaint Germans with the fact that the United States proposed to the U.S.S.R. a plan for mutual aerial inspection of each other's territory; b) to build up confidence in the workability and practicability of the proposal; c) to explain the benefits to be derived from the adoption of the plan; d) to create the strongest possible mass desire for the adoption of the plan; and finally e) to assure the greatest possible awareness that any country rejecting the proposal is against peace, disarmament, etc.

In this context the present survey provides data as to a) the extent of general and detailed knowledge of the plan and its origin; b) attitudes and expectations; c) awareness of advantages and disadvantages which would result from implementation and d) degree of confidence in the practicability and purpose of the proposal.

The survey was conducted between February 3rd and February 15th, 1956. The findings are based upon a 1801 case probability sample, representative of the West German population 18 years of age and over.

As usual, interviewing was conducted under German auspices by DIVO - Gesellschaft fuer Markt- und Meinungsforschung m.b.H.; Frankfurt/Main, a German survey organization working under contract with the Research Staff.

SUMMARY

Judging from the results of the present study, rank and file awareness of the U.S. proposal for mutual aerial inspection is rather low at the present time; only one third of the West Germans indicate some knowledge of the plan and merely 17% can correctly identify the plan as a suggestion made by the U.S. General approval of the proposal, however, reaches a majority after the respondents were briefly informed about the bare facts of the plan. Basic disapproval of it is mainly based upon pessimism in respect to the chances for adaption of the plan. Only a small minority (12%) expect that an agreement will be reached on the plan by the powers concerned. If the plan should not be realized, the majority of the skeptics tend to be on the side of the West saying Russia would be to blame in this event. Basic distrust of Russia seems to be the main reason for the lack of expectation. In other words, receptivity to the plan and the general climate of attitudes toward the proposal appear to be positive if people are adequately informed. The latter point is of primary importance since an unusually high amount of indecision can be found throughout the results, which is certainly based upon lack of information rather than an 'embarras de richness' of opinion.

Only slightly more than a third are able to name general advantages - and even fewer specific advantages for Germany - which would result from implementation of the plan. Nevertheless about twice as many people could think of advantages as were actually able to name disadvantages. Among those foreseen, advantages which serve peace are most often named. As to the question of which of the two sides East or West, would derive greater benefits from the plan, opinions seem to divide rather equally.

Even on the assumption that Russia and the U.S. would reach an agreement on the proposal, only a small minority expressed some confidence that the mutual inspection would be carried out as planned. Increased security is expected by a majority of the opinionated respondents, providing that both sides had agreed upon and implemented the plan; 'no opinion', however, is found to be very high in this connection.

Popular confidence that the mutual aerial inspection plan will - if implemented - achieve its ultimate purpose by contributing toward the maintenance of a long lasting world peace is not very high, since 47% register 'no opinion' on this query. However, the findings indicate that confidence tops lack of confidence by a ratio of 2 to 1.

I. Knowledge

One of the basic requirements to guide the project in the proper direction with adequate information is knowledge of the extent and kind of awareness presently existing among the population. Therefore the questions of how many people know about the U.S. proposal of mutual inspection and what they understand about it is of primary importance.

ONE THIRD OF WEST GERMANS AWARE OF PROPOSAL ...

Only 33% of the respondents reported having heard or read of the plan for mutual aerial inspection. Considering that on further inquiry only half (17%) of those indicating general knowledge of the plan could correctly identify the proposal as a suggestion made by the U.S., rank and file awareness has to be judged as rather low.

"Have you heard or read of a plan for mutual aerial inspection which was submitted to the Russians during the Four-Power conference of the heads of state in Geneva in July of last year?"

	<u>West Germany</u>
	Feb 1956
	(1801)
Yes, heard of it	33%
No, haven't heard of it	67
	<u>100%</u>

"And can you tell me who suggested this plan for mutual aerial inspection?" (Asked only of those having heard of plan)

Eisenhower	11%	17
Other Americans	6	
Other Western	1	
Russia	1	
Other answers	1	
No opinion	13	
	<u>33%</u>	

AWARENESS OF PLAN HIGHEST AMONG OPINION LEADING SEGMENTS ...

About half or more of the men, the better educated, the upper class people, of the politically and organizationally more active respondents and of the prestige occupation claim to be generally aware of the proposal for mutual aerial inspection. Among most other groups knowledge does not exceed 30%.

Greater awareness is claimed by those with higher incomes and by those in bigger cities. This corresponds with the previous findings since the opinion leading elements usually are financially better off and also mostly located in larger cities.

"Have you ever heard or read of a plan for mutual aerial inspection which was submitted to the Russians during the Four-Power conference of the heads of state in Geneva in July of last year?"

	Yes, <u>heard of it</u>	No, haven't <u>heard of it</u>	No. of <u>cases</u>
<u>Total West Germany</u>	33%	67% .. 100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>			
Men	50	50	760
Women	20	80	1041
<u>Education:</u>			
Elementary school	28	72	1488
Beyond elementary	58	42	313
<u>Income:</u>			
Up to 149 DM	17	83	179
150 to 299 DM	21	79	353
300 to 399 DM	35	65	404
400 to 499 DM	36	64	297
500 DM and more	45	55	459
No answer	27	73	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:®</u>			
Very active	59	41	111
Somewhat active	46	54	460
Remainder	26	74	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>			
Upper classes	51	49	94
Upper middle classes	44	56	476
Lower middle classes	30	70	983
Lower classes	17	83	248
<u>Age:</u>			
18 to 24 years	23	77	172
25 to 34 years	39	61	355
35 to 44 years	32	68	388
45 to 54 years	33	67	402
55 years and above	32	68	484

(Cont'd on next page)

® Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	<u>Yes, heard of it</u>	<u>No, haven't heard of it</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Party Preference:</u>			
SPD	35%	65%...100%	382
CDU/CSU	35	65	416
FDP	56	44	86
Other parties	39	61	82
No party	30	70	477
No opinion/No answer	25	75	358
<u>Occupation:</u>			
Professionals	65	35	51
Businessmen	50	50	128
White-collar workers	53	47	162
Skilled laborers	49	51	187
Semi-skilled laborers	29	71	184
Domestic service	24	76	58
Farmers, farmhands	25	75	108
Housewives	20	80	694
Unemployed	36	64	39
Pensioners; retired	35	65	168
Students; apprentices	55	45	22
<u>Religion:</u>			
Catholics	27	73	829
Protestants	37	63	908
Others	53	47	19
No religion	53	47	45
<u>Origin:</u>			
Natives	32	68	1443
Expellees, refugees	36	64	358
<u>City Size:</u>			
Up to 1,999	23	77	460
2,000 to 4,999	31	69	252
5,000 to 19,999	33	67	318
20,000 to 99,999	37	63	334
100,000 to 199,999	39	61	156
200,000 and more	42	58	281
<u>Land:</u>			
Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg, Bremen	50	50	205
Lower Saxony	28	72	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	30	70	514
Hesse	34	66	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	28	72	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	37	63	251
Bavaria	29	71	289

ABOUT A FIFTH INDICATE SOME UNDERSTANDING OF THE PLAN'S AIMS
AND PURPOSE ...

Those claiming to be generally aware of the plan were asked another question as to what the plan is all about and what aims it pursues.

Only 19% can be considered to have some understanding of what the plan is about while 15% either show no understanding of its aims (2%), or indicate that they rather don't know what they are talking about (13%).

"Would you please tell me what this plan is about - what aims it pursues?" (Asked of only those aware of plan)

SUMMARY TABLE

	<u>West Germany</u>
<u>Some understanding of aims</u>	19%
Mutual Armament Control	6%
Mutual Control (general)	6
Prevention of war and promotion of general security	5
Control of Atomic Weapons	1
Support of Disarmament Program	1
<u>No understanding of aims</u>	2
To further the security of international air traffic	*
Other answers	2
<u>No opinion/No answer</u>	<u>13</u> 34% [©]

* Less than one half of one per cent.

© Some respondents named more than one aim.

"Would you please tell me what this plan is about -
What aims it pursues?" (Asked only of those aware
of plan)

West Germany

Mutual armament control:

6%

- "Aircraft of the nations concerned may fly over each others territory, thus exercising mutual armament control."
- "Any changes with regard to armament, troop movements, etc. should be controlled by aircraft."
- "To find out whether the other side is weaker or stronger as regards armament and military forces."
- "Mutual control over aircraft production and airfields."
- "To control any secret preparations for a war, and thus to maintain the balance of power."

Mutual control (general):

6

- "The countries will exercise mutual control over their airspace."
- "A country's airspace shall be controlled by enemy aircraft."
- "Mutual control between all NATO countries over their airfields and a similar agreement with the Eastern countries."
- "Mutual control, air photographs can also be taken."
- "American aircraft can fly over Russian territory and vice versa."

Prevention of war and promotion of general security:

5

- "Mutual security, The Western countries will be protected against a surprise attack from the East."
- "In this way an atomic war would be prevented."
- "To exercise a sort of control over aerial warfare."
- "To maintain the security of individual countries, thus furthering world security."

Control of atomic weapons:

1

- "Well, it concerns atomic weapons. Russia could exercise control over America and vice versa."

Support of the disarmament program:

1

- "The vital point is armament restrictions."

To further the security of international air traffic:

*

- "By this plan the safety of air traffic should be increased."

Other answers:

2

- "The Americans aren't aware of their own stupidity! The others just want to find out about America's secret plans! To establish an air-raid protection system."
- "An alliance of the Western powers with the aim of mutual control."

No opinion/No answer:

13
34%[©]

* Less than one half of one per cent.

© Some respondents named more than one aim.

II. General Attitudes and Expectations

This section of the report is concerned with the general climate of attitudes toward the U.S. proposal. The inquiries reported upon were asked of all respondents after reading the following statement to those either having not heard of the proposal as such or who did not know the originators of the plan and/or its essentials:

INFORMATION:

In the inspection plan the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, proposed that American and Russia mutually inspect each others military installations from the air. To insure unhampered aerial inspection, Russian inspection planes are to use American air bases and vice versa.

MAJORITY INDICATES GENERAL APPROVAL OF PLAN ...

While only a negligible minority (7%) is decidedly against the U.S. proposal for mutual inspection, slightly more than half (52%) of the population approve of the plan.

Of further interest is the great amount of indecision (41%) - a factor which will repeatedly appear in the results of subsequent questions. However, it would seem that the general idea of the plan might have some popular appeal if people were properly informed.

"Considering everything, do you approve of this aerial inspection plan, or don't you approve of it?"

West Germany

Yes, approve of it	52%
No, don't approve of it	7
No opinion	41
	<u>100%</u>

SKPTICISM IN REGARD TO REALIZATION OF PLAN LEADING REASON FOR DISAPPROVAL ...

Almost half of those "disapproving" of the proposal base their attitude on the conviction that it never will be realized and that it is Utopia. Other reasons like "the plan would increase the danger of war" and "it would be more advantageous for Russia than for America" etc., are also mentioned.

"Considering everything, do you approve of this aerial inspection plan, or don't you approve of it?"

IF "No, don't approve of it":

"For what reasons don't you approve of it?"

West Germany

The plan will not be realized:

3%

"It's no use because the plan will never be realized - it's utopianism."

"It doesn't make sense. It can't be carried out properly."

"Because the plan isn't feasible, it's just a waste of money."

It would increase the danger of war:

1

"That's too risky for us all. If one side would manage to keep its preparations a secret that nation would feel strong enough to wage war."

"The slightest violation of a nation's air space, even if unintentional, might lead to a war that nobody wanted."

The plan would be more advantageous for Russia than for America:

1

"It doesn't make sense to me. The Russians would be granted liberties of which they would certainly take advantage. It would only encourage Russian espionage."

"Because the Russians would derive greater advantages from it than the Yanks."

Neither of the two would fulfil the agreement:

1

"It's bound to fail right from the start because they both want to cheat the other."

"Because the two parties don't deal honestly with each other. Neither of them would stick to the rules."

The East would not fulfil the agreement:

*

"The West, America that is, might perhaps be taken in by the Russians. I'm against any agreements with the East on principle, nothing will come of it."

"The East wouldn't stick to the agreement."

Every nation should look after itself:

*

"Within the boundaries of its own territory every nation should do as it pleases."

"They all should sweep before their own door."

Other answers:

1

"Because nowadays it's impossible to exercise an effective armament control by aerial inspection."

"They are still hostile towards each other."

No opinion/No answer:

*

7%

* Less than one half of one per cent.

SUPPORT FOR AERIAL INSPECTION PLAN HIGHEST AMONG OPINION LEADERS ...

As revealed again by population groupings, the opinion leading elements of the West German population are found to be more opinionated and more favorable in their basic attitude toward the proposal - the men, the better educated, higher income groups, prestige occupations, etc., indicate the highest support for the plan.

"Considering everything, do you approve of this aerial inspection plan, or don't you approve of it?"

	<u>Yes, approve of it</u>	<u>No, don't approve of it</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Total West Germany</u>	52%	7%	41%...100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>				
Men	64	9	27	760
Women	43	5	52	1041
<u>Education:</u>				
Elementary school	49	6	45	1488
Beyond elementary	63	10	27	313
<u>Income:</u>				
Up to 149 DM	40	3	57	179
150 to 299 DM	43	5	52	353
300 to 399 DM	54	8	38	404
400 to 499 DM	56	7	37	297
500 DM and more	62	7	31	459
No answer	38	9	53	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:®</u>				
Very active	68	12	20	111
Somewhat active	66	8	26	460
Remainder	45	5	50	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>				
Upper classes	66	6	28	94
Upper middle classes	58	9	33	476
Lower middle classes	51	6	43	983
Lower classes	37	5	58	248
<u>Age:</u>				
18 to 24 years	54	5	41	172
25 to 34 years	56	8	36	355
35 to 44 years	51	7	42	388
45 to 54 years	51	8	41	402
55 years and above	50	5	45	484
<u>Party Preference:</u>				
SPD	62	7	31	382
CDU/CSU	56	6	38	416
FDP	69	14	17	86
Other parties	55	12	33	82
No party	47	6	47	477
No opinion/No answer	38	4	58	358

(Cont'd on next page)

® Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	<u>Yes, approve of it</u>	<u>No, don't approve of it</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Occupation:</u>				
Professionals	57%	10%	33%...100%	51
Businessmen	62	12	26	128
White-collar workers	66	9	25	162
Skilled laborers	69	7	24	187
Semi-skilled laborers	50	8	42	184
Domestic service	38	5	57	58
Farmers, farmhands	54	6	40	108
Housewives	42	4	54	694
Unemployed	51	5	44	39
Pensioners; retired	55	6	39	168
Students; apprentices	64	9	27	22
<u>Religion:</u>				
Catholics	47	5	48	829
Protestants	56	7	37	908
Others	42	21	37	19
No religion	58	18	24	45
<u>Origin:</u>				
Natives	52	7	41	1443
Expellees, refugees	51	6	43	358
<u>City Size:</u>				
Up to 1,999	46	5	49	460
2,000 to 4,999	47	6	47	252
5,000 to 19,999	53	6	41	318
20,000 to 99,999	55	8	37	334
100,000 to 199,999	53	4	43	156
200,000 and more	60	10	30	281
<u>Land:</u>				
Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg,				
Bremen	67	11	22	205
Lower Saxony	45	6	49	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	51	7	42	514
Hesse	61	2	37	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	46	7	47	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	42	8	50	251
Bavaria	54	3	43	289

MOST DO NOT EXPECT AGREEMENT TO BE REACHED ON PLAN ...

When asked whether they think it likely or unlikely that the two powers - America and Russia - will reach an agreement on this plan, only about one out of ten expressed confidence in that possibility. Another four out of ten considered it unlikely while another five out of ten West Germans (48%) registered no opinion. By so doing they, too, indicated a basic skepticism that an agreement would be reached on the proposal.

Comparing the present findings with the result of a similar question asked in a survey shortly after the Geneva Summit Conference where the plan was proposed, the firm expression of skepticism found then has significantly decreased, while optimism indicated by the affirmative reply of "likely" has remained about the same. No opinion shows a substantial rise from 30% to 48% since August 1955, probably because the plan has not received a great deal of publicity since then.

"Do you consider it likely or unlikely that the two powers - America and Russia - will reach an agreement on this plan?"

	<u>West Germany</u>	
	Aug 1955* (865)	Feb 1956 (1801)
Likely	14%	12%
Unlikely	56	40
No opinion	<u>30</u>	<u>48</u>
	100%	100%

* In the previous survey the question was slightly different:

"And is it your impression that this proposal is likely to be accepted by Russia or not?"

OPINION LEADERS MOST PESSIMISTIC CONCERNING REALIZATION OF THE PLAN ...

The women, the less educated, lower-class people, etc. are - as expected - significantly less opinionated, i.e. are more prone to have no opinion on the question of whether America and Russia are likely to reach an agreement. This should be given careful consideration when comparing the population groupings. Even so, however, the opinion leading segments - the counterparts of the above mentioned groups - are considerably more pessimistic as to the likelihood of an agreement being reached between the two powers on this proposal.

"Do you consider it likely or unlikely that the two powers - America and Russia - will reach an agreement on this plan?"

	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Un-likely</u>	<u>Qualified answer</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Total West Germany</u>	12%	39%	1%	48%...100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>					
Men	16	52	1	31	760
Women	9	30	1	60	1041
<u>Education:</u>					
Elementary school	12	36	1	51	1488
Beyond elementary	11	56	1	32	313
<u>Income:</u>					
Up to 149 DM	11	22	1	66	179
150 to 299 DM	11	28	1	60	353
300 to 399 DM	13	44	2	41	404
400 to 499 DM	12	43	-	45	297
500 DM and more	13	50	2	35	459
No answer	7	28	2	63	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:®</u>					
Very active	19	55	-	26	111
Somewhat active	15	51	1	33	460
Remainder	10	34	1	55	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>					
Upper classes	10	50	-	40	94
Upper middle classes	13	46	2	39	476
Lower middle classes	13	38	1	48	983
Lower classes	9	26	*	65	248
<u>Age:</u>					
18 to 24 years	13	39	1	47	172
25 to 34 years	15	48	1	36	355
35 to 44 years	10	40	1	49	338
45 to 54 years	12	40	1	47	402
55 years and above	11	32	1	56	484
<u>Party Preference:</u>					
SPD	15	44	2	39	382
CDU/CSU	14	40	*	46	416
FDP	13	63	-	24	86
Other parties	10	50	1	39	82
No party	11	36	1	52	477
No opinion/No answer	7	31	1	61	358

* Less than one half of one per cent.

® Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	<u>Likely</u>	<u>Un- likely</u>	<u>Qualified answers</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Occupation:</u>					
Professionals	8%	63%	2%	27%...100%	51
Businessmen	12	54	1	33	128
White-collar workers	14	57	1	28	162
Skilled laborers	20	50	1	29	187
Semi-skilled laborers	9	48	*	43	184
Domestic service	14	21	-	65	58
Farmers, farmhands	14	42	2	42	108
Housewives	10	28	1	61	694
Unemployed	13	46	-	41	39
Pensioners; retired	13	32	2	53	168
Students; apprentices	23	32	-	45	22
<u>Religion:</u>					
Catholics	13	33	1	53	829
Protestants	11	44	2	43	908
Others	21	31	-	48	19
No religion	16	55	-	29	45
<u>Origin:</u>					
Natives	13	38	1	48	1443
Expellees, refugees	9	43	*	48	358
<u>City Size:</u>					
Up to 1,999	11	33	2	54	460
2,000 to 4,999	8	42	*	50	252
5,000 to 19,999	13	40	1	46	318
20,000 to 99,999	12	38	1	49	334
100,000 to 199,999	15	36	3	46	156
200,000 and more	13	49	1	37	281
<u>Land:</u>					
Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg,					
Bremen	10	62	1	27	205
Lower Saxony	10	30	2	58	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	13	37	1	49	514
Hesse	17	37	4	42	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	7	34	-	59	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	10	39	1	50	251
Bavaria	14	38	*	48	289

* Less than one half of one per cent.

STRONG INCLINATION TO BLAME RUSSIA SHOULD PLAN NOT BE REALIZED ...

Those feeling it unlikely that an agreement on the proposal will be reached by the two powers concerned, were asked a further question in this context, namely, who - they think - would be more to blame if the plan would not be realized. Only a tiny minority of 3% of them said "America," but the large majority (66%) think Russia would be more to blame.

These findings again suggest that, by and large, the rank and file will be on the side of the West in respect to the plan if people are adequately informed.

"In your opinion, which country would be more to blame if this plan would not be realized - America or Russia?" (Asked of only those feeling it unlikely that agreement on plan will be reached.)

	<u>West Germany</u>	
America	1%	3%
Russia	26	66
Both equally to blame	8	20
No opinion	4	11
	<u>39%</u>	<u>100%</u>

BASIC DISTRUST OF RUSSIA SEEN AMONG REASONS WHY RUSSIA WOULD BE MORE TO BLAME ...

Among the reasons why Russia would be blamed if the mutual inspection plan would not be realized, are expressions that "Russia would wreck all Western plans" and "Russia doesn't want to give away her secrets." Throughout all comments, however, a basic distrust towards Russia becomes apparent.

"In your opinion, which country would be more to blame if this plan would not be realized - America or Russia?"

IF "Russia":

"What makes you think so?"

West Germany

Russia would wreck all Western plans:

9%

"Since they vetoed all proposals at all the conferences up till now, there's no reason why they wouldn't go on doing so."

"Russia always intrigues against the others."

"They won't agree to anything and will also sabotage this plan."

"They would always demand something to which America couldn't consent."

"Up to this day Russia has turned down all similar proposals. I don't believe in any change in their attitude."

(Cont'd on next page)

Russia doesn't want to give her (military) secrets away:

7%

- "The Russians don't want to let anybody look behind the Iron Curtain. That has been proven by their policy up till now."
- "They don't want the others to know about their secret armament."
- "It seems to me that Russia, owing to its political structure, (it's a totalitarian country after all) can't afford to let the others discover its secrets."
- "I feel Russia is not inclined to expose anything that has been kept a secret up till now."
- "The Russians wouldn't submit to any control over their country."

Russia stubbornly pursues its political course:

2

- "Have the Russians ever agreed to anything? They pursue their aims most stubbornly."
- "Russia won't be dictated to, unless the political course in Moscow were changed."
- "Their different ideology makes me think so. They pursue a course of violence."

Russia aims at world rule:

2

- "I feel they want to spread Communism and to achieve world domination."
- "Russia aims at world domination and won't stand interference."
- "Russia wants to rule the world and therefore it will fish in troubled water."

Russia cannot be trusted:

2

- "I think they're dishonest. They aren't straightforward in their policy."
- "The Russians are fond of secret-mongering and one cannot believe their word."
- "Russia's policy is inscrutable."

Russia does not really want peace:

1

- "By threatening all the world, Russia wants to hold people in suspense. They want the cold war to continue."
- "The Russians don't have an honest desire for peace."

The plan is more disadvantageous for Russia than for the Western Powers:

1

- "The Russians know that the Western Powers will gain more by this plan than they themselves will."
- "Russia would be at a greater disadvantage."

The Russians are too suspicious:

1

- "They are always too distrustful."

Other answers:

1

- "I know the Russians from experience."

No opinion/No answer:

*
26%

* Less than one half of one per cent.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF REASONS WHY THE U.S. WOULD BE MORE TO BLAME ...

Since the percentage of those who would blame the U.S. if the proposal would not be realized is a bare one per cent, the answers have not been categorized, but merely listed for illustrative purposes.

"In your opinion, which country would be more to blame if this plan would not be realized - America or Russia?"

IF "America":

"What makes you think so?"

"It seems to me the capitalistic system is bound to lead to another war."

"The way I see it, they want to maintain their position of world leadership. They want to hinder Russia in its political development."

"As long as Dulles is in office, the Americans make empty promises. They do everything for show."

"The Americans don't want other nations to find out about their designs."

"The Western Powers are not willing to submit to any control."

"They probably don't even want to come to an understanding."

"America doesn't want to be outdone by any other country. They got involved with the Russians once, but would certainly not do it again."

"Russian competition gets too strong - that's all I can say about this subject."

"America knows for certain that Russia can't agree to this plan - as it's not possible for the Russians to fly to America."

"The Americans would have to sacrifice too much."

REASONS FOR BLAMING BOTH RUSSIA AND THE U.S. ...

Those respondents (8% of the total population) holding the view that both sides should be blamed if no agreement were reached about the plan, say that Russia as well as the U.S. are both too concerned with keeping their secrets, too egoistic, too stubborn and really too little interested to be able to reach an understanding about the proposal.

"In your opinion, which country would be more to blame if this plan would not be realized - America or Russia?"

IF "Both equally to blame":

"What makes you think so?"

West Germany

Neither of the two countries is willing to give away its military secrets:

2%

"Neither the one nor the other wants to let on about its military potential."

"Russia and America would have to divulge details about their air strength and they won't do that."

"They won't allow others to inspect their country - neither of them."

(Cont'd on next page)

Both countries are stubborn and unable to reach an understanding:

2%

"Neither of the two will give way. Antagonism between them is too strong."

"Neither the one nor the other makes a sincere effort to come to terms yet."

"Neither of the two is willing to yield. They don't trust each other and will never give way."

Neither side is sincerely interested in the realization of the plan:

2

"I feel their interest in the realization of this plan isn't strong enough."

"The Americans may have proposed this thing, but they knew all the time that Russia would never consent to it."

"That wasn't meant seriously. It's just idle talk."

They both attend only to their interests:

1

"Both sides only think of their own interests."

"Each wants to put the other at a disadvantage."

They both aspire to world domination:

1

"It's the old tug-of-war for supremacy."

"I believe both strive for world rule."

Other answers:

1

"In such cases, both are to blame."

No opinion/No answer:

*

9%^②

* Less than one half of one per cent.

② Some respondents gave more than one answer.

III. Implementation

The previous chapter dealt with the general climate of opinion, with basic attitudes and expectations regarding the plan, that is to say, the receptivity of the West German population towards the idea of 'Mutual Inspection for Peace'. This section of the report focuses on opinions concerning eventual implementation of the plan (based upon the optimistic hypothesis of a preceding agreement reached by the powers concerned). In other words, a) what advantages and disadvantages resulting from the implementation of the plan are seen by the West German population, and b) what is the degree of confidence in the practicability and the true purpose of the proposal.

MORE GENERAL ADVANTAGES FORESEEN IN IMPLEMENTATION THAN SPECIFIC BENEFITS FOR GERMANY ...

For the purpose of probing as much as possible into the realm of possible advantages resulting from implementation of the plan, two questions were put to the respondents, and presented in the following table. Comparison of the replies to both queries reveals that the percentage of those mentioning general advantages exceeds - slightly but significantly - the proportion of those who see specific advantages for Germany. Again, the proportion with 'no opinion' in both questions is rather high, amounting to about half of all respondents. Only about one third (36%) see 'general advantages' and even fewer (28%) are able to name advantages that would especially accrue for West Germany.

"In your opinion, what advantages would result from the implementation of the plan?"

"And what advantages would accrue for Germany?"

	<u>General Advantages</u>	<u>Advantages for Germany</u>
Advantages	36%	28%
No advantages	18	22
No opinion	46	50
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

DECREASED WAR DANGER MAIN ADVANTAGE ...

Most of those who could name benefits resulting from the realization of the proposal reported advantages which directly or indirectly serve peace. The most frequently mentioned reason was the decrease in danger of war as an advantage of the implementation of the plan.

The great majority (64%), however, was unable to think of any advantage.

"In your opinion, what advantages, would result from the implementation of this plan?"

West Germany

ADVANTAGES

38

Advantages which serve peace

22 30%

The danger of war would not be so great

12%

Armament could not be kept a secret

5

The nations would come to trust and understand each other

5

A surprise attack would be impossible

4

An armament race (especially with atom bombs) would be out of the question

4

Other advantages

8

It would be an effective mutual control (general)

6

Other answers

2

NO ADVANTAGES

18

No opinion/No answer

46
102%[©]

© Some respondents gave more than one answer.

"In your opinion, what advantages would result from the implementation of this plan?"

COMMENTS IN DETAIL ...

West Germany

The danger of war would not be so great:

12%

"With aerial inspection, wars wouldn't be likely to start so easily."

"If it were done the right way, it would be a better guarantee for peace."

"It would result in a more secure world peace."

"This could perhaps be a way to prevent or postpone aerial warfare."

"If one country is allowed aerial inspection of the other, no country would become reckless and wars could be avoided."

Armament could not be kept a secret:

5

"One country would know the other's air strength and could make certain that armament is fairly equal on both sides."

"The balance of power would be maintained. No country could be far ahead of the other in armament."

"It wouldn't be bad. One could find out what other countries have in the way of armament."

"America could get an insight into Russian industry."

"One would always know how strong Russia is and take care that one is equally strong."

The nations would come to trust and understand each other:

5

"In my opinion, this is a chance for the governments of the nations concerned to learn to trust their colleagues."

"I think this would help to eliminate mutual distrust. There wouldn't be so much talk about atom bombs any more."

"This international cooperation would facilitate understanding and above all closer human contact. As a result tensions would ease and a stronger feeling of security would prevail with all nations."

"As the inspection is to be mutual, better understanding will develop between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R."

A surprise attack would be impossible:

4

"The two countries could watch each other and thus prevent surprise attacks, as both would be able to see any war preparations undertaken by the opponent."

"It would be a good thing as no country could launch a Blitzkrieg then. It might also be a way to find out what the Russians are up to."

"No country could arm in secret."

(Cont'd on next page)

(Cont'd from preceding page)

West Germany

An armament race (especially with atom bombs) would be out of the question:

4%

"The armament race would be discontinued. The money now spent for armament could then be used to promote the welfare of the nation."

"Both countries would know where they stand, and an armament race would be impossible."

"The world could sigh with relief - the nightmare of atomic bombs would be over."

It would be an effective mutual control (general):

6

"Both would have to put their cards on the table for mutual inspection."

"No country could fool the other."

"Either of the countries would always be informed about the other."

"The two powers could have no secrets from each other."

Other answers:

2

"They can examine air samples in labs and find out whether they contain radioactive particles."

"In any case there is no harm in trying."

No advantages:

18

"I don't expect any advantages because aerial inspection is impossible. The Russians will build their atomic bombs where they can't be seen from American airplanes."

"Mistrust will only grow - and ways will be found to circumvent aerial inspection."

"It's no use. Each would only try to find new ways to cheat the other. There would only be more espionage."

No opinion/No answer:

46
102%

© Some respondents gave more than one answer.

INCREASED SECURITY MAIN ADVANTAGE FOR GERMANY ...

On the question of particular advantages which would accrue for Germany from the implementation of the proposal for mutual aerial inspection, almost three quarters (72%) cannot name any benefits. In fact fully 22% say very firmly that there would be 'no advantages' at all and 50% expressed 'no opinion'.

Among the benefits reported, however, it is the advantage of increased military security which receives top play.

"And what advantages would accrue for Germany?"

SUMMARY TABLE

		<u>West Germany</u>
<u>ADVANTAGES</u>	29%	
<u>Advantages which serve peace</u>		24%
Germany's chances for peace would be greater		20%
A surprise attack would not be possible		2
Political tensions in the world would lessen		2
<u>Other advantages</u>		5
Reunification would be more likely		1
Germany would get more information concerning other nations		1
Other answers		3
<u>NO ADVANTAGES</u>	22	
No opinion/No answer	<u>50</u> 101% [©]	

© Some respondents gave more than one answer.

"And what advantages would accrue for Germany?"

COMMENTS IN DETAIL ...

West Germany

Germany's chances for peace would be greater:

20%

"Perhaps a lasting peace, also for us."

"It is good for Germany if there's peace in the world."

"A war with Germany as the theater of operations would be prevented."

"We would be left in peace if the others carry on mutual control."

"Certainly greater security."

A surprise attack would not be possible:

2

"The advantage for Germany would be that we in Germany could not be overpowered by a sudden attack. We would know what is going on behind the Iron Curtain."

"Germany, too, would benefit from the elimination of the element of surprise."

"People needn't be so afraid of sudden air raids any more."

"Security measures, such as the evacuation of towns and air warnings, could be carried out in time. With aerial inspection counter actions could be taken more quickly and we would be better prepared in a crisis."

Political tensions in the world would lessen:

2

"It would be an advantage for us if the atmosphere of mistrust could be dispersed."

"We, too, would benefit from an easing of tensions."

Reunification would be more likely:

1

"Could be a starting point for the reunification of Germany."

"Perhaps reunification would be realized more quickly."

"Perhaps the Russians will then relinquish East Germany."

Germany would get more information concerning other nations:

1

"Germany would then be informed on the military strength of all countries."

"We would get to know the new Russian installations."

"It would be a good thing since the Americans could inform us about the situation in Russia."

Other answers:

3

"It would render air defense unnecessary."

No advantages:

22

No opinion/No answer:

50
101%²

© Some respondents gave more than one answer.

ADVANTAGES OF PLAN OUTWEIGH DISADVANTAGES IN THE EYES OF WEST GERMANS ...

Comparing the two questions concerning possible advantages and disadvantages it becomes apparent that - even with a high amount of 'no opinion' - advantages outweigh the disadvantages in the present thinking of the German people about the plan.

While twice as many can name advantages of the proposal than firmly state 'there are no advantages', the picture becomes exactly reversed when people were asked about the disadvantages (here twice as many said 'there are no disadvantages' as were actually able to name disadvantages.)

"In your opinion, what advantages would result from the implementation of this plan?"

"And can you name any disadvantages which would, in your opinion, result from this plan?"

	<u>Advantages</u>	<u>Disadvantages</u>
Can name advantages or disadvantages	36%	16%
Firm opinion that there will -be <u>no</u> advantages		
-be <u>no</u> disadvantages	18	34
No opinion	<u>46</u> 100%	<u>50</u> 100%

INTENSIFIED ESPIONAGE AND GREATER SECRECY MIGHT BE THE RESULT OF IMPLEMENTATION AND LEAD TO CONFLICTS ...

The disadvantages possibly resulting from the realization of the plan in the opinion of the people in Germany are found in the replies to the following question:

"And can you name any disadvantages which would, in your opinion, result from this plan?"

West Germany

Mutual control might lead to conflicts, even to war:

3%

"If one party tries to control the other, they will end up by quarrelling. Such a scheme has never worked before."

"If one party would be allowed to fly over the territory of the other, friction might increase."

"Airplanes might be shot down by mistake."

"It would be a disadvantage for those other countries which Americans and Russians would be flying over all the time. A sovereign state cannot put up with airplanes of other nationalities penetrating its air space continually."

(Cont'd on next page)

Espionage activities could not be controlled:

3%

"The heightened danger of espionage activities is a grave disadvantage which outweighs the possible advantage of the plan contributing toward world peace."

"Both sides would be likely to intensify their espionage activities."

"The parties involved - I'm mainly thinking of the Russians - might engage in espionage to get details about the new secret weapons. They might try to spy out what's going on in that respect."

"The plan offers a magnificent chance to the Russians to drop agents over Western territories and to pick up messages."

Armament programs could be carried on in secret:

3

"The plan might result in a game of hide-and-seek. Both parties would increase their air forces secretly."

"It would only lead to the armament factories being built underground, and thus nothing would be changed."

"It might lead to America hoodwinking Russia, and vice versa."

"The Russians might deceive the others and lull them into security. That's one of the things that could happen. They'd relocate their military installations and leave dummy plants for the Americans to see. And then one fine day they'd take them unawares."

Military secrets could no longer be guarded:

2

"Every change would be noticed by the opposite side."

"They would get wise to each other's tricks."

"The two parties would be informed about each other's movements."

An armament race would ensue:

1

"The plan would only result in a stepping up of the armament programs on both sides."

"The party which believes itself to be in a weaker position would increase its efforts to catch up with the other side."

Russia could catch up with the Americans in the military sector:

1

"The Russians would soon catch up with the Americans in the armament drive."

"There are quite a few things the Americans have got which the Russians might copy."

(Cont'd on next page)

(Cont'd from preceding page)

West Germany

Germany would be the one to suffer:

1%

"I'm sure we would be the losers."

"It would be detrimental to Germany if a rapprochement between the two parties came about, for then reunification will never be achieved."

Russia would couple aerial inspection with Communist expansion:

*

"The Russians would go along on this aerial inspection plan only if they had a chance to disseminate their ideas in the West at the same time."

"It would provide the Russians with even better opportunities to spread Communism."

Other answers:

2

"Maybe the Russians would try to meddle in the affairs of the West, to direct things and to set the tone for everything."

"People would have to pay heavier taxes just because of this."

No disadvantages:

34

"No, I foresee only advantages."

"No this plan would not entail any disadvantages."

"No, if this plan would be carried out intelligently, only advantages would result from it."

"If the two parties would come to an agreement on aerial inspection and would live up to it, then there would be no disadvantages."

No opinion/No answer:

$\frac{50}{100\%}$

* Less than one half of one per cent.

OPINION EQUALLY DIVIDED AS TO WHO WOULD DERIVE GREATER ADVANTAGES FROM IMPLEMENTATION ...

After respondents were given some opportunity for adequate consideration of the possible advantages and disadvantages they were asked a further query in the same connection. Namely, which of the two sides, East or West, would derive greater benefits from the plan.

Opinions seem to divide rather equally on this question. Both, East and West, are cited by 11% as deriving greater advantages. Another 30% think both sides will have the equal advantages from the plan's implementation, and nearly half (48%) of the respondents are undecided.

"Which of the two sides, East or West, will derive greater advantages from the implementation of this plan?"

	<u>West Germany</u>
East	11%
West	11
Both the same	30
No opinion	48
	<u>100%</u>

REASONS WHY EAST WILL HAVE GREATER ADVANTAGES ...

Among the reasons why the East would derive greater advantages two types of answers are given most often a) Russia's vast expanse makes inspection difficult, and b) the anticipated lack of cooperation from the East in the mutual inspection procedures.

"Which of the two sides, East or West, will derive greater advantages from the implementation of this plan?"

IF "East":

"Why would the East derive greater advantages?"

West Germany

Because due to its vast expanse, the East is more difficult to control than the West:

3%

"Because the West is very densely populated, while much can be hidden in the immense areas in the East."

"Because it will prove awfully difficult to check up on what's going on in Russia as it's such a vast country."

"The Russians have so many possibilities to build air bases in out-of-the-way places."

(Cont'd on next page)

Because, contrary to the West, the East would not keep any agreements and would prevent the other party from controlling its military installations:

2%

"As the West is so meticulously honest, the Russians would soon gain an insight into the conditions in the West and they could be counted on to exploit this advantage, while they'd find excuses to prevent the Americans from flying over the territory of the U.S.S.R. at the same time."

"I do not think the East would fulfill an agreement entered into. - They would be keen to discover what's going on in the West, but would be reluctant to let the others see anything."

Because the East maintains a more efficient espionage system:

1

"Because the espionage apparatus of the Russians is larger and functions more efficiently than that of the West."

"Because the East will be allowed to snoop around on American air bases, thus they won't have to conquer the West in a war. They will be able to grab it one fine day. They are preparing for this day by their espionage activities, just the way they operate right here in Bonn."

Because then the East would catch up with the West in the armament drive:

1

"The East would step up its production even more once it knew for sure how far the Americans have gotten."

"Because the network of airways of the Americans is much more developed than that of the Russians, If the Russians were allowed to fly over U.S. territory, they could see and learn a lot about things which had been kept from them so far."

Because the East is militarily superior to the West anyway:

1

"Well, in the final analysis, the Russians are the stronger party."

"They are ahead of the West in airplane construction."

Because the Russians are smarter than the Americans and know how to exploit an advantage better:

1

"The Russians would cleverly exploit all advantages coming their way and that's why they would be more than a match for the Americans."

"Because the Russians know how to turn anything that comes their way into an advantage."

Other answers:

1

"Because in case the East should launch an attack, it will be easy for them to occupy certain strategic positions of the West."

"They would fare better under such an arrangement."

No opinion/No answer:

2
12%⁰

@ Some respondents gave more than one answer.

REASONS WHY WEST WOULD DERIVE GREATER ADVANTAGES ...

Those feeling the West would have more benefits from the plan's realization think mainly of the fact that much less is known about the military installations of the East than about those of the West and feel therefore that the West would have more to gain from the deal.

"Which of the two sides, East or West, will derive greater advantages from the implementation of this plan?"

IF "West":

"Why would the West derive greater advantages?"

West Germany

Because much less is known about the military installations of the East than about those of the West:

6%

"The East knows the military secrets of the West, whereas the West hasn't yet penetrated the secrets of the East."

"I'm sure the Americans know less about Russian armament than the Russians know about the situation in the U.S."

"Because so far the Russians have carried out their armament program in great secrecy, while particulars about many of the military installations of the Americans are common property."

"Because the East has more possibilities to hide its military establishments from the eyes of the world than the West."

Because thanks to its geographic location, the West could control the East more easily than vice versa:

1

"The West is more favorably situated. They come from across the sea, and thus they are in a better position to orient themselves."

"Because it's easier for the West to control Russia than for Russia to control the West, for Russia and America are separated by large oceans."

Because the West is militarily superior to the East anyway:

1

"Because we and our allies combined have larger armed forces at our command than the Russians."

"The West has a stronger position due to NATO."

Because in a war the West would be more seriously imperiled than the East:

1

"Because the West is more densely populated than the East, and thus it would be more vulnerable in case of war."

Because with the danger of war banned, the West could devote itself to developing business and industry:

*

"In that case we needn't spend any money on armament any more and could concentrate on producing consumer goods only."

"Then the present boom would continue even stronger."

Other answers:

1

"Perhaps in that way the reunification of Germany could be brought about."

"Then the West could patrol the international airways unhampered and fewer incidents would occur. For then the East couldn't fire on Western airplanes any more."

No opinion/No answer:

1
11%

LOW CONFIDENCE IN ULTIMATE EXECUTION ...

On the assumption that Russia and the U.S. would reach an agreement on the proposal, people were asked about their degree of confidence that the mutual aerial inspection would be executed as presently planned. Four out of ten register little or no confidence, another 41% have no opinion, and only a small minority of 15% are "fairly confident" that the inspection be carried out as planned. A negligible handful (3%) indicate a high degree of confidence by saying they are "very confident."

"Supposing Russia and American would reach an agreement on this plan: How confident are you that mutual aerial inspection will actually be carried out as planned - are you very confident, fairly confident, only little confident, or not at all confident?"

	<u>West Germany</u>
Very confident	3%)
Fairly confident	15 } 18%
Little confident	26)
Not at all confident	15 } 41
No opinion	41
	<u>100%</u>

OPINION LEADERS RELATIVELY LESS CONFIDENT THAN OTHERS ...

While a high amount of indecision is revealed among the women, lesser educated people, etc. actual majorities indicating little or no confidence that the proposal would be carried out as planned are found among the leading segments of the population - for example, among the men, the better educated, upper-class people, and the prestige occupations.

"Supposing Russia and America would reach an agreement on this plan: How confident are you that mutual aerial inspection will actually be carried out as planned - are you very confident, fairly confident, only little confident, or not at all confident?"

	<u>Very/ fairly confident</u>	<u>Little/ not at all confident</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Total West Germany</u>	18%	41%	41%...100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>				
Men	23	54	23	760
Women	15	31	54	1041
<u>Education:</u>				
Elementary school	18	37	45	1488
Beyond elementary	22	57	21	313
<u>Income:</u>				
Up to 149 DM	11	23	66	179
150 to 299 DM	16	32	52	353
300 to 399 DM	20	42	38	404
400 to 499 DM	18	46	36	297
500 DM and more	23	49	28	459
No answer	13	39	48	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:®</u>				
Very active	24	54	22	111
Somewhat active	25	51	24	460
Remainder	15	36	49	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>				
Upper classes	16	56	28	94
Upper middle classes	22	46	32	476
Lower middle classes	19	39	42	983
Lower classes	12	29	59	248
<u>Age:</u>				
18 to 24 years	19	38	43	172
25 to 34 years	22	46	32	355
35 to 44 years	15	45	40	388
45 to 54 years	18	40	42	402
55 years and above	18	35	47	484

(Cont'd on next page)

® Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	<u>Very/ fairly confident</u>	<u>Little/ not at all confident</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Party Preference:</u>				
SPD	23%	46%	31%...100%	382
CDU/CSU	22	42	36	416
FDP	27	52	21	86
Other parties	19	48	33	82
No party	14	41	45	477
No opinion/No answer	12	29	59	358
<u>Occupation:</u>				
Professionals	14	64	22	51
Businessmen	19	58	23	128
White-collar workers	25	51	24	162
Skilled laborers	28	51	21	187
Semi-skilled laborers	13	51	36	184
Domestic service	12	28	60	58
Farmers, farmhands	18	45	37	108
Housewives	16	29	55	694
Unemployed	18	38	44	39
Pensioners; retired	21	36	43	168
Students; apprentices	23	36	41	22
<u>Religion:</u>				
Catholics	16	37	47	829
Protestants	20	43	37	908
Others	32	37	31	19
No religion	22	62	16	45
<u>Origin:</u>				
Natives	19	40	41	1443
Expellees, refugees	18	41	41	358
<u>City Size:</u>				
Up to 1,999	17	32	51	460
2,000 to 4,999	22	37	41	252
5,000 to 19,999	16	41	43	318
20,000 to 99,999	17	47	36	334
100,000 to 199,999	19	44	37	156
200,000 and more	23	47	30	281
<u>Land:</u>				
Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg, Bremen	25	49	26	205
Lower Saxony	22	30	48	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	17	42	41	514
Hesse	24	39	37	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	19	32	49	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	17	38	45	251
Bavaria	12	48	40	289

PLURALITY THINK PURPOSE OF PLAN WILL BE ACHIEVED IF IMPLEMENTED
BY BOTH SIDES ...

Proceeding one step further in the chain of assumption, respondents were asked whether, if East and West had agreed upon and implemented the plan, both sides would gain increased security (the goal of the plan). The majority of the opinionated respondents held the view that both sides would then enjoy increased military security. This is, however, only 39% of the total population - because of the great extent of 'no opinion' again.

Nevertheless, only a small minority (14%) take a pessimistically negative stand.

"Supposing this plan is implemented by both sides - America and Russia - do you think that the purpose of the plan will then be achieved, or, to put it differently, will both sides then enjoy increased military security, or won't they?"

	<u>West Germany</u>
Increased security	39%
No increased security	14
No opinion	47
	<u>100%</u>

REASONS WHY MILITARY SECURITY WOULD NOT BE INCREASED FOR BOTH SIDES ...

Among the answers given to the question asking for their reasons, it is apparent that people are mainly thinking in terms of deficiencies in the inspection plan as such.

"Supposing this plan is implemented by both sides - America and Russia - do you think that the purpose of the plan will then be achieved, or, to put it differently, will both sides then enjoy increased military security, or won't they?"

IF "No increased security":

"In your opinion, why would military security not be increased for both sides?"

	<u>West Germany</u>
<u>Because both sides will secretly continue with their armament program:</u>	4%

"They both aren't honest - the things one doesn't want the other side to see wouldn't be shown anyway."

"Everything can be camouflaged so that only those things will be shown which may or shall be seen by the others."

"Because they both could continue with their armament program without the other side knowing anything."

"Because both of them will secretly continue to arm."

(Cont'd on next page)

Because aerial inspection is inadequate:

3%

"Because military security is not dependent on aerial inspection."

"The biggest plants in both countries are underground factories, therefore aerial control would be no use."

"Because these days military preparations aren't always visible from the air. Just think of the bases for the V2 rockets, they were small and well camouflaged."

Because aerial inspection will not be effective in removing the causes of the tension between East and West:

2

"There are deeper reasons for the tension between East and West. What's the use of this plan if the two ideologies don't agree with each other?"

"These two powers agree with each other like fire and water."

"There will never be a common way for these two diametrically opposed ideologies."

Because the Russians would shun control:

2

"Russia will find possibilities to evade control."

"The Russians wouldn't be dictated to by anyone. Perhaps they would only feign an agreement."

"Because Russia knows only too well how to keep its preparations secret. They will find ways and means enough to conceal their real strength."

Because both sides will do as they please and would not conform to the regulations:

1

"Neither of them would stick to the rules. They'll do as they please."

"Because things will remain as they are. They all do what they like."

Because the plan would facilitate espionage:

*

"The whole thing will end up in espionage."

"Nothing but spying."

Other answers:

1

"Because you never know whether things will stop at inspection flights."

"Because it would give cause for more discontent."

No opinion/No answer:

1
14%

* Less than one half of one per cent.

ONLY FAIR DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE THAT PLAN WILL CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS PEACE ...

The ultimate purpose and eventual goal of the mutual aerial inspection plan is its intended contribution toward increased mutual military security and lasting world peace. Therefore the following question was used in order to test the degree of confidence that the ultimate purpose of the plan would be realized.

Grouping the answer categories in 'confidence' and 'lack of confidence', the findings indicate that 'confidence' tops 'lack of confidence' by a ratio of 2 to 1. Only somewhat more than a third of the population (36%), however, express confidence while 17% express little or no confidence. The percentage of 'no opinion' (again high - 47%) cannot be safely attributed to the 'lack of confidence group' since this 'no opinion' represents indecision based upon lack of information, rather than an 'embarra de richness' of opinion.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

	<u>West Germany</u>
To a very high degree	8%)
To a high degree	13)36%
To a certain degree	15)
To a small degree	7)17
Not at all	10)
No opinion	<u>47</u>
	100%

REASONS FOR HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE ...

Most of the reasons supporting this type of answer center around the enhanced chances for a lasting world peace.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a very high degree" or "To a high degree":
"What makes you think so?"

SUMMARY TABLE

	<u>West Germany</u>
<u>Chances for maintaining peace would be enhanced</u>	15%
The danger of war would be reduced	6%
Mutual control would mean the end of military secrets	6
Armament would be curtailed	2
Surprise attacks would be prevented	1
<u>General understanding between East and West would be promoted</u>	4
A rapprochement and cooperation between the two parties would be promoted	4
Other answers	1
No opinion/No answer	<u>1</u>
	21%

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a very high degree" or "To a high degree":
"What makes you think so?"

West Germany

COMMENTS IN DETAIL ...

The danger of war would be reduced:

6%

"Under such an arrangement one party could observe the other more closely than it can do now, and thus it would be more difficult for all concerned to prepare for war."

"If a mutual control would be exercised, it would be too risky for any one party to start a war."

"No country would dare to trigger a war."

"One party will fear the other and that means none of them will start a war."

"For a time at least the danger of war would be banished."

Mutual control would mean the end of military secrets:

6

"Then rearmament could not be carried out secretly any more. Through aerial inspection the centers of the war industries would become known and thus they would be exposed to enemy attacks."

"If the plan would be carried out, it would no longer be possible for one party to deceive the other and to surround itself with a cloak of secrecy."

"I feel this would largely dispose of the present secret-mongering."

"Everybody will be watching everybody else."

"The two parties would have a better chance to keep an eye on each other."

Armament would be curtailed:

2

"Armament wouldn't be stepped up any more, to the contrary, it would be reduced, as each would be informed about the armed strength of the other."

"Once the control would be exercised over the big powers, they wouldn't prepare so intensively for an atomic war any longer."

Surprise attacks would be prevented:

1

"A lot would be gained if the different nations could be sure that a surprise attack could not be launched."

"No nation could launch a blitzkrieg against its enemy any longer."

(Cont'd on next page)

A rapprochement and cooperation between the two parties would be promoted:

4%

"I'm sure a rapprochement could be achieved by carrying out this plan."

"It seems to me that in that way the rigid fronts would be thawed."

"If through this plan mutual distrust could be removed, this would mean considerable progress."

"It would contribute towards promoting mutual understanding."

Other answers:

1

"This plan would be a success if people who have their heads screwed on in the right way are to handle it."

"Then the odds would be the same for all concerned."

No opinion/No answer:

$\frac{1}{21\%}$

REASONS FOR SOME DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE ...

Among this group of respondents - those who express some confidence in the ultimate purpose of the plan - a third replied somewhat skeptically by saying that the plan's implementation does not guarantee the maintenance of peace.

The remaining people who expressed some confidence explained their stand more or less in the same manner as noted in the previous code.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a certain degree":
"What makes you think so?"

SUMMARY TABLE

	<u>West Germany</u>
<u>Chances for maintaining peace would be enhanced</u>	7%
Through mutual control armament could be limited	4%
The danger of war would be reduced	2
Surprise attacks would be prevented	1
<u>General understanding between East and West would be promoted</u>	2
A rapprochement between the two sides could be achieved	2
<u>Implementation of the plan does not guarantee the maintenance of peace</u>	5
There is no guarantee that both parties will stick to the plan	2
Implementation of this plan is not an essential factor in preventing war	2
The plan might be successful provided both parties keep the agreement which they would conclude	1
The East cannot be relied on to comply with an agreement	*
<u>Other answers</u>	*
<u>No opinion/No answer</u>	$\frac{1}{15\%}$

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a certain degree":
"What makes you think so?"

West Germany

COMMENTS IN DETAIL ...

Through mutual control armament could be limited:

4%

"Neither of the parties could go ahead with armament programs unconcernedly as they'd be watched."

"Then one party needn't be so worried about the war potential of the other any more."

"In that way a balance of armed might could be more easily achieved. Then no party could get the upper hand."

"Nobody could risk playing his own game while disregarding the others."

The danger of war would be reduced:

2

"If one party knows what weapons of destruction the other has got, it will beware of provoking the other side and thus unleashing a war."

"Mutual control will help to preserve peace."

Surprise attacks would be prevented:

1

"It would no longer be possible for anybody to launch a surprise attack."

"Once one party can check up on the war preparations of the other, a surprise attack will be an impossibility."

A rapprochement between the two sides could be achieved:

2

"If such a control could be established, a general easing of tensions would ensue."

"Then there is a better chance for reaching an agreement as both parties would have to make concessions."

There is no guarantee that both parties will stick to the plan:

2

"Many things could be moved underground so that they would be hidden from the eyes of the other side."

"I do not think that either of the participants would be completely honest and frank."

Implementation of this plan is not an essential factor in preventing war:

2

"It may help a little, but it certainly doesn't suffice to banish the grave danger of war."

"There may be an incident through which a war will be unleashed, and then this inspection plan will offer no security any more."

(Cont'd on next page)

(Cont'd from preceding page)

West Germany

The plan might be successful provided both parties keep the agreement which they would conclude:

1

"As long as both nations act as agreed upon, the plan may work."

"It might be a success provided such a plan would be executed in the spirit of the whole thing."

The East cannot be relied on to comply with an agreement:

*

"The Russians are not likely to put all their cards on the table."

Other answers:

*

"Once this plan would be carried through, the parties concerned would hit on something new to circumvent it."

No opinion/No answer:

$\frac{1}{15\%}$

* Less than one half of one per cent.

REASONS FOR LACK OF CONFIDENCE ...

The feasibility of the plan as such and its implementation is seriously doubted by those having little or no confidence that the realization of the plan would contribute to world peace. Comments like 'the plan has no influence on war and peace' and 'none of the participants would play fair and cooperate in the long run' are among the leading reasons given.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace."

IF "To a small degree" or "Hardly or not at all":
"What makes you think so?"

SUMMARY TABLE

	<u>West Germany</u>
<u>Implementation of the plan does not guarantee the maintenance of peace</u>	13%
This plan will have no influence on war or peace	6%
Both parties could be counted on to sabotage a treaty by secretly going ahead with rearmament	5
Russia cannot be expected to stick to the plan	2
<u>General understanding between East and West would not be promoted</u>	1
Existing tensions would not be eased through this plan	1
It would only result in espionage activities on both sides	*
The U.S. and Russia will never reach an agreement	*
<u>Other answers</u>	1
<u>No opinion/No answer</u>	<u>2</u> 17%

* Less than one half of one per cent.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a small degree" or "Hardly or not at all":

COMMENTS IN DETAIL ...

West Germany

This plan will have no influence on war or peace:

6%

"It wouldn't be a decisive factor. I mean, it would not decide whether there will be war or peace."

"It seems to me a showdown between East and West is unavoidable as America and Russia are engaged in a fierce competitive struggle."

"The warlike spirit would only subside for a short while."

"It wouldn't be enough to avert war."

"If peace depended on this plan only, things would be in a sorry state, indeed."

Both parties could be counted on to sabotage a treaty by secretly going ahead with rearmament:

5

"They'd only camouflage their moves and secretly continue their armament efforts."

"In the long run, none of the participants would play fair."

"There are too many possibilities to keep one's secrets while consenting to aerial inspection."

"Both will do exactly what they please."

Russia cannot be expected to stick to the plan:

2

"The Russians will always do what suits their purposes, disregarding the other powers."

"The Ivans conclude a non-aggression pact with one country, but at the same time they make trouble in some other part of the world; and they'd employ such a practice in this case also."

Existing tensions would not be eased through this plan:

1

"I believe there are much more important issues to be taken care of before the tensions between East and West could be relaxed,"

"This plan wouldn't help to settle the existing conflicts,"

It would only result in espionage activities on both sides:

*

"Then both powers would make aerial photographs of the other country and in case of an armed conflict, they would use them."

The U.S. and Russia will never reach an agreement:

*

"They'll never be in agreement. There will be a tug-of-war and both will try to be the dominating power."

Other answers:

1

"This plan is no longer hot news and it has become outdated after the exchange of messages between Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Eisenhower."

"As long as one side fears the other, the situation can be kept in hand."

No opinion/No answer:

$\frac{2}{17\%}$

* Less than one half of one per cent.

A P P E N D I X

"In your opinion, which country would be more to blame if this plan would not be realized - America or Russia?"

	America	Russia	Both equally to blame	No opinion	Not asked	No. of cases
<u>Total West Germany</u>	1%	26%	8%	4%	61%...100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>						
Men	2	33	11	6	48	760
Women	1	21	5	3	70	1041
<u>Education:</u>						
Elementary school	1	24	7	4	64	1488
Beyond elementary	2	36	11	7	44	313
<u>Income:</u>						
Up to 149 DM	-	13	6	3	78	179
150 to 299 DM	*	20	5	3	72	353
300 to 399 DM	2	27	10	5	56	404
400 to 499 DM	2	29	9	3	57	297
500 DM and more	2	35	8	5	50	459
No answer	-	15	8	5	72	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:©</u>						
Very active	2	33	13	7	45	111
Somewhat active	2	34	10	5	49	460
Remainder	1	22	7	4	66	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>						
Upper classes	1	33	10	6	50	94
Upper middle classes	2	31	9	4	54	476
Lower middle classes	1	25	8	4	62	983
Lower classes	*	17	5	4	74	248
<u>Age:</u>						
18 to 24 years	2	25	8	4	61	172
25 to 34 years	-	35	9	4	52	355
35 to 44 years	1	24	8	7	60	388
45 to 54 years	1	25	9	5	60	402
55 years and above	-	23	5	4	68	484
<u>Party Preference:</u>						
SPD	1	31	9	3	56	382
CDU/CSU	-	31	7	2	60	416
FDP	3	43	12	5	37	86
Other parties	1	43	5	1	50	82
No party	2	19	9	6	64	477
No opinion/No answer	-	17	6	8	69	358
<u>Occupation:</u>						
Professionals	-	39	16	8	37	51
Businessmen	1	31	14	8	46	128
White-collar workers	3	38	10	6	43	162
Skilled laborers	3	32	11	4	50	187
Semi-skilled laborers	-	32	13	3	52	184
Domestic service	-	14	5	2	79	58
Farmers, farmhands	-	31	7	4	58	108
Housewives	1	19	5	3	72	694
Unemployed	3	28	5	10	54	39
Pensioners; retired	1	23	5	3	68	168
Students; apprentices	-	23	-	9	68	22

(Cont'd on next page)

* Less than one half of one per cent.

© Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	<u>America</u>	<u>Russia</u>	<u>Both equally to blame</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>Not asked</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Religion:</u>						
Catholics	1%	20%	8%	4%	67%...100%	829
Protestants	2	30	7	5	56	908
Others	-	31	-	-	69	19
No religion	-	33	16	6	45	45
<u>Origin:</u>						
Natives	1	25	8	4	62	1443
Expellees, refugees	2	31	6	4	57	358
<u>City Size:</u>						
Up to 1,999	1	23	5	4	67	460
2,000 to 4,999	*	28	10	4	58	252
5,000 to 19,999	2	28	7	3	60	318
20,000 to 99,999	1	22	9	6	62	334
100,000 to 199,999	1	21	9	5	64	156
200,000 and more	2	33	9	5	51	281
<u>Land:</u>						
Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg,						
Bremen	1	49	7	5	38	205
Lower Saxony	1	20	5	4	70	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	2	24	7	4	63	514
Hesse	1	25	7	4	63	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	2	14	13	5	66	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	*	28	7	4	61	251
Bavaria	1	22	10	5	62	289

* Less than one half of one per cent.

"Which of the two sides, East or West, will derive greater advantages from the implementation of this plan?"

	<u>East</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>Both the same</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Total West Germany</u>	11%	11%	30%	48%...100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>					
Men	15	15	37	33	760
Women	7	7	25	61	1041
<u>Education:</u>					
Elementary school	9	9	30	52	1488
Beyond elementary	18	18	34	30	313
<u>Income:</u>					
Up to 149 DM	7	7	21	65	179
150 to 299 DM	10	6	26	58	353
300 to 399 DM	12	11	31	46	404
400 to 499 DM	13	9	36	42	297
500 DM and more	13	17	33	37	459
No answer	3	6	29	62	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:@</u>					
Very active	20	22	29	29	111
Somewhat active	15	15	37	33	460
Remainder	9	8	27	56	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>					
Upper classes	8	20	35	37	94
Upper middle classes	14	13	34	39	476
Lower middle classes	10	9	30	51	983
Lower classes	8	6	23	63	248
<u>Age:</u>					
18 to 24 years	11	8	33	48	172
25 to 34 years	13	15	31	41	355
35 to 44 years	12	10	30	48	388
45 to 54 years	9	10	31	50	402
55 years and above	9	9	28	54	484
<u>Party Preference:</u>					
SPD	15	10	35	40	382
CDU/CSU	11	15	31	43	416
FDP	18	16	37	29	86
Other parties	10	17	28	45	82
No party	8	6	33	53	477
No opinion/No answer	9	9	20	62	358
<u>Occupation:</u>					
Professionals	16	20	35	29	51
Businessmen	21	14	36	29	128
White-collar workers	22	16	32	30	162
Skilled laborers	13	16	40	31	187
Semi-skilled laborers	7	6	40	47	184
Domestic service	7	7	26	60	58
Farmers, farmhands	10	10	31	49	108
Housewives	7	8	23	62	694
Unemployed	13	20	26	41	39
Pensioners; retired	9	9	34	48	168
Students; apprentices	14	9	41	36	22
<u>Religion:</u>					
Catholics	9	9	27	55	829
Protestants	11	12	33	44	908
Others	31	11	11	47	19
No religion	29	9	35	27	45

(Cont'd on next page)

@ Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	<u>East</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>Both the same</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>
<u>Origin:</u>					
Natives	10%	10%	31%	49%...100%	1443
Expellees, refugees	12	12	28	48	358
<u>City Size:</u>					
Up to 1,999	9	8	28	55	460
2,000 to 4,999	7	8	35	50	253
5,000 to 19,999	15	11	23	51	318
20,000 to 99,999	13	13	27	47	334
100,000 to 199,999	8	4	42	46	156
200,000 and more	10	16	35	39	281
<u>Land:</u>					
Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg, Bremen	16	21	35	28	205
Lower Saxony	9	10	27	54	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	12	9	25	54	514
Hesse	8	14	35	43	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	10	4	31	55	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	10	9	32	49	251
Bavaria	9	8	33	50	289

"Supposing this plan is implemented by both sides - America and Russia - do you think that the purpose of the plan will then be achieved, or, to put it differently, will both sides then enjoy increased military security, or won't they?"

	Increased security	No increased security	No opinion	No. of cases
<u>Total West Germany</u>	39%	14%	47%...100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>				
Men	50	19	31	760
Women	31	9	60	1041
<u>Education:</u>				
Elementary school	37	12	51	1488
Beyond elementary	49	22	29	313
<u>Income:</u>				
Up to 149 DM	27	6	67	179
150 to 299 DM	32	7	61	353
300 to 399 DM	41	16	43	404
400 to 499 DM	44	18	38	297
500 DM and more	48	17	35	459
No answer	24	11	65	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:©</u>				
Very active	54	20	26	111
Somewhat active	54	18	28	460
Remainder	32	11	57	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>				
Upper classes	54	19	27	94
Upper middle classes	42	18	40	476
Lower middle classes	39	13	48	983
Lower classes	30	5	65	248
<u>Age:</u>				
18 to 24 years	41	10	49	172
25 to 34 years	41	18	41	355
35 to 44 years	39	14	47	388
45 to 54 years	38	15	47	402
55 years and above	39	9	52	484
<u>Party Preference:</u>				
SPD	51	13	36	382
CDU/CSU	46	12	42	416
FDP	49	27	24	86
Other parties	38	21	41	82
No party	33	14	53	477
No opinion/No answer	26	9	65	358
<u>Occupation:</u>				
Professionals	47	24	29	51
Businessmen	45	24	31	128
White-collar workers	49	23	28	162
Skilled laborers	58	17	25	187
Semi-skilled laborers	37	15	48	184
Domestic service	31	9	60	58
Farmers, farmhands	39	10	51	108
Housewives	31	9	60	694
Unemployed	31	20	49	39
Pensioners; retired	39	10	51	168
Students; apprentices	45	14	41	22

(Cont'd on next page)

© Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	<u>Increased</u> <u>security</u>	No <u>increased</u> <u>security</u>	No <u>opinion</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>cases</u>
<u>Religion:</u>				
Catholics	36%	12%	52%...100%	829
Protestants	42	13	45	908
Others	42	16	42	19
No religion	44	36	20	45
<u>Origin:</u>				
Natives	39	13	48	1443
Expellees, refugees	39	14	47	358
<u>City Size:</u>				
Up to 1,999	32	11	57	460
2,000 to 4,999	40	10	50	252
5,000 to 19,999	38	18	44	318
20,000 to 99,999	43	13	44	334
100,000 to 199,999	41	13	46	156
200,000 and more	45	17	38	281
<u>Land:</u>				
Schleswig/Holstein,				
Hamburg, Bremen	55	20	25	205
Lower Saxony	32	11	57	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	37	15	48	514
Hesse	45	12	43	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	31	11	58	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	39	10	51	251
Bavaria	37	12	51	289

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

	To a very high degree/ To a high degree	To a certain degree	To a small degree/ Not at all	No opinion	No. of cases
<u>Total West Germany</u>	21%	15%	17%	47%...100%	1801
<u>Sex:</u>					
Men	27	19	25	29	760
Women	16	12	11	61	1041
<u>Education:</u>					
Elementary school	20	12	16	52	1488
Beyond elementary	25	24	26	25	313
<u>Income:</u>					
Up to 149 DM	16	9	10	65	179
150 to 299 DM	20	8	12	60	353
300 to 399 DM	20	17	20	43	404
400 to 499 DM	22	14	22	42	297
500 DM and more	24	20	20	36	459
No answer	13	14	12	61	109
<u>Opinion Leadership Scale:®</u>					
Very active	32	18	25	25	111
Somewhat active	25	21	22	32	460
Remainder	18	12	15	55	1230
<u>Socio-Economic Status:</u>					
Upper classes	30	27	18	25	94
Upper middle classes	25	16	23	36	476
Lower middle classes	18	15	16	51	983
Lower classes	18	6	10	66	248
<u>Age:</u>					
18 to 24 years	19	14	14	53	172
25 to 34 years	20	18	23	39	355
35 to 44 years	19	16	21	44	388
45 to 54 years	20	13	18	49	402
55 years and over	23	12	11	54	484
<u>Party Preference:</u>					
SPD	29	14	19	38	382
CDU/CSU	20	18	17	45	416
FDP	29	16	28	27	86
Other parties	24	12	20	44	82
No party	19	11	19	51	477
No opinion/No answer	11	15	12	62	358
<u>Occupation:</u>					
Professionals	25	24	27	24	51
Businessmen	19	23	26	32	128
White-collar workers	30	20	23	27	162
Skilled laborers	26	21	26	27	187
Semi-skilled laborers	21	10	22	47	184
Domestic service	10	17	7	66	58
Farmers, farmhands	16	16	17	51	108
Housewives	16	10	12	62	694
Unemployed	23	18	21	38	39
Pensioners; retired	29	13	14	44	168
Students; apprentices	41	9	23	27	22

(Cont'd on next page)

® Determined by political and organizational participation.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

	To a very high degree/ To a high degree	To a certain degree	To a small degree/ Not at all	No opinion	No. of cases
<u>Religion:</u>					
Catholics	18%	14%	16%	52%	829
Protestants	23	15	17	45	908
Others	26	10	32	32	19
No religion	22	18	40	20	45
<u>Origin:</u>					
Natives	20	15	18	47	1443
Expellees, refugees	21	13	16	50	358
<u>City Size:</u>					
Up to 1,999	17	12	14	57	460
2,000 to 4,999	26	11	15	48	252
5,000 to 19,999	19	12	22	47	318
20,000 to 99,999	20	18	17	45	334
100,000 to 199,999	14	22	22	42	156
200,000 and more	27	17	18	38	281
<u>Land:</u>					
Schleswig/Holstein,					
Hamburg, Bremen	31	17	24	28	205
Lower Saxony	16	13	14	57	222
North Rhine/Westphalia	19	14	17	50	514
Hesse	26	15	15	44	190
Rhineland/Palatinate	14	18	16	52	130
Wuerttemberg/Baden	20	12	17	51	251
Bavaria	20	17	18	45	289

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 069044144